

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|----------------------------|----------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/790,319 | 03/01/2004 | Gerald Wayne Kearby | | 9003 |
| Gerald Kearby | 7590 10/07/200 | 8 | EXAMINER | |
| NeuroTone, Inc. | | | LLOYD, EMILY M | |
| 2317 Broadway Suite 250 | y Street | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| Redwood City, | CA 94063 | 3736 | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 10/07/2008 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Application No. Applicant(s) 10/790.319 KEARBY ET AL Notice of Abandonment Examiner Art Unit

| | EMILY M. LLOYD | 3736 | |
|---|--|-----------------------|--------------------|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ears on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence ad | dress |
| This application is abandoned in view of: | | | |
| Applicant's failure to timely file a proper reply to the Office (a) A reply was received on (with a Certificate of M period for reply (including a total extension of time of) | ailing or Transmission dated month(s)) which expired on | | |
| (b) ☐ A proposed reply was received on, but it does r | not constitute a proper reply under 3 | 7 CFR 1.113 (a) to t | he final rejection |
| (A proper reply under 37 CFR 1.113 to a final rejection application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C | Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); | | |
| (c) ☐ A reply was received onbut it does not constitution final rejection. See 37 CFR 1.85(a) and 1.111. (See e | | mpt at a proper rep | ly, to the non- |
| (d) ☐ No reply has been received. | | | |
| 2. Applicant's failure to timely pay the required issue fee and from the mailing date of the Notice of Allowance (PTOL-8 | 5). | | |
| (a) The issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, was), which is after the expiration of the statutory pe Allowance (PTOL-85). | | | |
| (b) The submitted fee of \$ is insufficient. A balance | of \$ is due. | | |
| The issue fee required by 37 CFR 1.18 is \$ T | he publication fee, if required by 37 | CFR 1.18(d), is \$ | _ |
| (c) The issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, has no | t been received. | | |
| 3. Applicant's failure to timely file corrected drawings as requ Allowability (PTO-37). | ired by, and within the three-month p | period set in, the No | tice of |
| (a) ☐ Proposed corrected drawings were received on after the expiration of the period for reply. | (with a Certificate of Mailing or Tran | smission dated |), which is |
| (b) No corrected drawings have been received. | | | |
| The letter of express abandonment which is signed by the the applicants. | attorney or agent of record, the ass | ignee of the entire i | nterest, or all of |
| 5. The letter of express abandonment which is signed by an 1.34(a)) upon the filing of a continuing application. | attorney or agent (acting in a repres | entative capacity ur | nder 37 CFR |
| 6. The decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interfere of the decision has expired and there are no allowed claim | | e the period for see | king court review |
| 7. ☑ The reason(s) below: | | | |
| The reply received 18 June 2008 was not accompar and the fee was not paid before the expiration of the | | | |
| /Max Hindenburg/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3736 | Emily M Lloyd Examiner Art Unit: 3736 | | |
| Petitions to revive under 37 CFR 1.137(a) or (b), or requests to withdra | w the holding of abandonment under 37 | CFR 1.181, should be | promptly filed to |

minimize any negative effects on patent term.
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
PTOL-1432 (Rev. 04-01)